

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RONALD DERYKE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORIZON HEALTHCARE INC.,

et al.,

Defendants.

/

Case No. 24-12857

Jonathan J.C. Grey

United States District Judge

Curtis Ivy, Jr.

United States Magistrate Judge

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE PLAINTIFF'S SECOND
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL (ECF No. 50), GRANTING
IN PART MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF No. 51), and
ORDERING DEFENDANTS JONES AND MURRAY TO RESPOND TO
COMPLAINT**

The Court denied without prejudice Plaintiff's first motion for appointment of counsel just over one month ago. (ECF No. 38). The only change in circumstance Plaintiff raises in his second motion for appointed counsel is that he has since been paroled and no longer has a legal writer to help him draft documents. (ECF No. 50). This is an insufficient reason to appoint counsel. Plaintiff now has access to public libraries or other public spaces providing internet service he can use to conduct legal research, without the time constraints of a law library call-out. This motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for the reasons stated in the first Order denying the first motion and because release from prison is not a sufficient reason to appoint counsel.

Plaintiff also moved for an extension of time to respond to an unspecified motion. Because Plaintiff filed responses to all but Defendants Roland and Poland's April 23, 2025, motion for summary judgment, the Court assumes Plaintiff seeks an extension to respond to that motion. (ECF No. 51). On April 23, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to respond to the motion by May 15, 2025. In his motion to extend that deadline, he says he recently got the motion ordering his response by May 15th, and he needs time to review that order and do legal research. He asked for an additional 45 days.

Since Plaintiff mailed his motion to extend before May 15th, the Court can grant his motion if he shows good cause for an extension. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). Plaintiff relied on his status as a parolee without legal training as reason for the extension. This is good cause for an extension this time. That said, the Court will not grant an additional 45 days. The motion is **GRANTED IN PART**, and Plaintiff's response brief is **due by June 12, 2025**. No further extensions will be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

Lastly, Defendants Murray and Jones recently appeared through counsel. The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff's complaint, finds that Defendants may not waive filing a responsive pleading under 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(g). These Defendants are **ORDERED** to respond the complaint **within 21 days** of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The parties here may object to and seek review of this Order, but are required to file any objections within 14 days of service as provided for in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and Local Rule 72.1(d). A party may not assign as error any defect in this Order to which timely objection was not made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Any objections are required to specify the part of the Order to which the party objects and state the basis of the objection. When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in effect unless it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge. E.D. Mich. Local Rule 72.2.

Date: May 22, 2025

s/Curtis Ivy, Jr.
Curtis Ivy, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that this document was served on counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System or by First Class U.S. mail on May 22, 2025.

s/Sara Krause
Case Manager
(810) 341-7850